

**General Plan 2020 Steering Committee Meeting
December 14, 2002 – Minutes**

Attendees:

Mark Price	Alpine
Margarite Morgan	Bonsall
Tim McMaster	Crest-Dehesa
John Elliot	Descanso
Dan Neirinckx	Jamul/ Dulzura
John Horton	Julian
Richard Hensle	Lakeside
Joe Chisholm	Pala Pauma
Sam Mitchell	Ramona
Gordon Hammers	Potrero
Lois Jones	San Dieguito
John Ferguson	Spring Valley
Luis Schooler	Tecate
Gil Jemmott	Twin Oaks
Jack Phillips	Valle de Oro
Larry Glavinic	Valley Center

Visitors:

Paul Gonya	Alpine
John Stewart	San Dieguito
Parke Troutman	UCSD
Kevin Davis	Public
Charlene Ayers	Public
C.T. Davis	Bonsall
Dutch VanDierendonck	Ramona
Jan VanDierendonck	Ramona
Sachiko Kohatsu	County of San Diego, District 3
Bev Esrif	Campo/Lake Morena
Mike Thomez	MERIT
J. Tanalski	Valley Center
Paul Ulrich	Crest View Properties
Carol Leone	Public

Planning Commissioners:

Bryan Woods

Staff:

Gary Pryor
Ivan Holler
Rosemary Rowan
LeAnn Carmichael
Sandy Gillins
Karissa Selvester

Start: 9:10

Introductions.

B. Woods: We do have a quorum. Rosemary will give an overview of our agenda for the day.

R. Rowan: There are three items on our agenda: Land Use Framework, Clustering discussion, and the New Working Copy maps – We will have staff here to

distribute and discuss those. With the Land Use Framework, our focus is the Regional Categories, which we have discussed at great length, but have never taken a vote on them. The categories start with Rural Lands, and then move into Semi-Rural, Village and Village core (the two densities within the Village Limit Line). We also have a category called "No Jurisdiction". Finally, there is the Transit Node, which is a proposed mixed-use development area near either an express bus stop, or trail transit.

In addition, there have been some minor changes to the residential designations that you voted on before. The existing densities of 29 and 24 du/ac are being changed to 24 and 20 du/ac. The reason has to do with the Housing Element. State law has threshold at 20 du/ ac for affordable housing. We've lowered 29 to 24 because it is very difficult to build at 29 within the unincorporated areas. That's the only proposed change there. We have already voted on most of the non-residential.

- B. Woods:** Lets take on the first item on here. Any comments or concerns on Village Core?
- D. Neirinckx:** (possibility of applying 1 du/ 10 ac in some proposed Rural areas)
- M. Morgan:** We don't start at 1 du/ 10 ac because it is west of the water line.
- J. Chisholm:** On upper residential- if there were a density bonus, could that happen to be higher than 24 du/ ac?
- R. Rowan:** Yes, that is correct.
- L. Glavinic:** A question with affordable housing- if it is at 20 du/ ac, we ought to have some special conditions that it is for affordable housing.
- B. Woods:** One condition may be to allow three stories within the County. It doesn't fit in every community, but would fit well in some.
- J. Phillips:** If we are going to have the change that we have discussed, I agree with Rosemary in going from 29 du/ ac to 24 du/ ac and adding 20 du/ ac. It's hard to build at a higher density with constraints- one is the parking requirements. The reason that change would make sense is that we have open space requirements with (fire issues). The unincorporated fire districts just aren't prepared for that kind of density. Our local recreation is another reason. In a lot of our apartment zoned areas, you run into problem that areas that are zoned for apartments are subdivided for single family lots, so you can't build a project that conforms. You are going to have to change your west of the CWA density range.
- P. Gonya (public):** Each jurisdiction must meet its housing requirements. Are we going to be in contradiction (with the General Plan goals/ state housing requirements)?
- R. Rowan:** There are two different issues, one is meeting your housing element, the other is making sure that you are able to build at that level.
- P. Gonya (public):** This is a math formula. With all of the categories, can we meet the housing element of the GP? Will that information be made available?
- R. Rowan:** Yes. We will be updating the Housing Element.
- I. Holler:** You are mixing apples and oranges. Making a recommendation on a change in a density. The change in the proposed density is a separate issue from if we have enough lands designated to accommodate.
- P. Gonya (public):** My second question is on page five regarding footnote four: "...the intended public use". Does the "intended public use" mean what is there now or what is desired?
- R. Rowan:** The intent of that footnote was to respond to concerns made by this group, particularly regarding schools and allowing sewer line capacity for that school only, so that it is not growth-inducing.
- P. Gonya (public):** Back to original question- Is the Urban Limit Line fixed now?
- B. Woods:** No, it needs to be fixed.
- P. Gonya (public):** I don't see anything in here that says that you can extended that as you need to in order to meet the housing requirements.

- R. Hensle:** The parking issue really crams the units down to meet the parking requirements. This has to be worked out.
- G. Pryor:** We are making a list of things that need to be fixed in our zoning ordinance.
- J. Ferguson:** Kenwood apartments has every problem that Jack is talking about and they can't get their yield.
- M. Price:** Paul (P. Gonya) did bring up the issue back on page four. I prefer that it says "may be limited" instead of "should be limited". The benefit would be running the services to the school.
- J. Phillips:** For this new gentleman here- the Land Use Plan is designed to fulfill the population projections, not to respond to some Housing Element that changes every so many years. But that Housing Element should not drive the general plan densities. This means ruining suburban communities to meet housing goals. Using the horse and cart example- the horse is the population projections. The cart is the Housing Element, which has to be based on the population projections. I ask that the chair stick to the things that we are on.
- B. Woods:** I totally agree. Let's shift back into Village Core. Please limit your comments to item one on Village Core.
- G. Hammers:** What ever happened to the ratios of building to lot size- that seems to be overlooked in these comments. These issues have to be together.
- G. Pryor:** You are talking about decoupling some of these things. Use should fit inside the standards that you set. Right now some of these things need to be realigned.
- B. Woods:** When we work on the zoning ordinance isn't Floor Area Ratio (FAR) going to be considered?
- R. Rowan:** These are just summary descriptions and in the Land Use Element we will probably expand upon these so that more detail is addressed.
- S. Mitchell:** This is the second or third meeting that I have been to here and as I read through this document, I find words that can be interpreted several different ways- almost for the purpose that at a later time people can be interpret it in a different way. It is also suspicious that we have Village Limit Lines- Who set them? Why?
- B. Woods:** We haven't set those. And I think that the wordsmithing was done because these have to accommodate the uniqueness of all the different communities. There is still time for you to exercise what you need for your community.
- MOTION: (J. Phillips) Add to Village Core definition/ Special Circumstances: "20 du/ ac and 24 du/ ac West of the CWA to accommodate affordable housing". In Favor- 10. Opposed- 4.**
- L. Glavinic:** The full motion was to add to a second special circumstances. The purpose was to reflect that Valley center doesn't fit, but that we can provide for our affordable housing.
- B. Woods:** But in terms for doing it for every community, there was no agreement. Let's move on to Village/ Rural estates.
- L. Jones:** (We have a concern about the how this relates to areas with septic issues like Del Dios.)
- G. Pryor:** Our Environmental Health Department is the better expert in septic. At this point in time, I don't know how much credibility to put in the manager report. If you are dealing with a localized problem, you have to deal with as a separate issue.
- S. Mitchell:** (Re: "site design methods") We complain about our poor infrastructure, but we are trying to reduce that cost. It seems that the push for this is coming from special interests.

- G. Pryor:** You are missing the point. We're looking at what is more cost effective. Changing the site design saves money on development and then saves money for the buyer.
- M. Morgan:** With this infrastructure word in it, I would think that they would not have to do more off site.
- R. Rowan:** No. We can work to clarify
- B. Woods:** It is a buzz word that gets thrown around. It is not intent to plan without the appropriate infrastructure.
- G. Pryor:** How about adding "on-site infrastructure"?
- P. Gonya (public):** Does this inhibit the clustering single loaded streets...that's a design example?

MOTION: (S. Mitchell) To change the Semi-Rural Estates definition by adding "on-site infrastructure". Second (G. Hammers). Unanimously approved.

- B. Woods:** Next let's go on to Rural Lands.
- D. Neirinckx:** I don't understand why you're trying to make Rural Lands open space. Why force private land owners into having open space?
- B. Woods:** I think the Ramona grasslands would be an example of this for the preservation of open space.
- D. Neirinckx:** Would it then become State or County or Federal property?
- B. Woods:** Not necessarily.
- R. Rowan:** This is a Regional Category- it is much more broad.
- G. Pryor:** Lets just take open space preservation out of there.
- G. Hammers:** We may as well take out "recreational". Wouldn't those be mitigation just like open space preservation?
- G. Pryor:** Not necessarily.
- L. Jones:** The problem is putting definitions of land uses in the Regional Category.
- R. Rowan:** It is all descriptive, but it doesn't mean those land uses are necessary or that you have to have it.
- G. Pryor:** I think what Dan is concerned with is that will automatically become the land use.

MOTION: (D. Neirinckx) To remove "open space preservation" in the first sentence. Second (M. Morgan).

- R. Hensle:** Is there a more permissive word?
- B. Woods:** I think its pretty broad as is.
- G. Hammers:** If we take out the word "preservation" then you've fixed it.
- B. Woods:** Dan, do you agree? Margarite...yes?

VOTE on modified motion (remove only the word "preservation"). In Favor- 12 for. Opposed- 1. Motion carries.

- B. Woods:** On to "No jurisdiction". Is everyone comfortable with this definition? (General agreement follows).

MOTION: To accept definition of "No Jurisdiction" as written. In Favor- 13. Opposed- 1. Motion carries.

- B. Woods:** Next- Village Limit Line.
- G. Jemmott:** With clustering- since some areas are without the benefit of a Village Limit Line, can we have to benefit of having that added in?
- G. Pryor:** The Village Limit Line is intended for those areas with sewer/water. What you are raising is (more applicable to areas without services. In these cases, it is possible to design product so it doesn't induce growth).

G. Jemmott: In our area, use of the Village limit line would be appropriate for the exact same reason.

G. Pryor: It is to contain something, but you have separate problems where you already have lines. You have a separate issue and this will not address that issue. We will have to come up with a different policy to deal with what you are dealing with- I don't have something off the top of my head.

B. Woods: Why don't we turn it over to staff and have them come up with something since it is a separate issue?

G. Hammers: That would be helpful to us if we could have some sort of rural Village Core. It would be really nice if we could have some sort of line- a good tool for us.

G. Pryor: Let us deal with that at the same time as we deal with Gil's issue.

S. Mitchell: That can that be reworded: "land areas within a Village limit line ...".

G. Pryor: Who are they going to apply to?

S. Mitchell: Sewer districts.

G. Pryor: what happens if want to expand beyond that? You are predetermining the areas that would get that service.

T. Mc Master: I would like that to be more permissive. Just because they're going to bring water in, they're not necessarily going to bring sewer.

G. Pryor: Good point. his should really say "sewer and water".

T. Mc Master: We want a definition that will protect our Country Towns.

G. Pryor: Like before- we will have to address that with something else.

T. Mc Master: We are concerned that going to have (growth-inducement with service expansion?).

G. Pryor: We will come back with a new action item that will address what you are speaking to.

Discussion of the flexibility to move Village Limit Line under proposed definition.

L. Carmichael: I don't see wording in here that prevents you from moving the line later.

M. Price: If you want to move it later, then the definition would have to be changed.

I. Holler: (A GPA may be proposed to do this.)

M. Price: So you are saying that a GPA can be for a community and not for the whole County?

S. Mitchell: When you put the word "should" in there, it allows the property owner to bring sewer into area where other property owners may not want it. Instead, we should use "may apply for".

MOTION: (S. Mitchell) Replace "should have access to existing or planned sewer" with "may" in the Village Limit Line definition. Second (J. Phillips). In Favor- 13. Opposed- 1.

B. Woods: We have one more item: Transit Node. Any comments?

MOTION- (J. Phillips) To approve Transit Node as written. Second (L. Glavinic). In Favor- 12. Opposed- 1 (J. Ferguson).

B. Woods: Let's go to page fourteen, Public/ Quasi-Public Facilities.

J. Phillips: I'm on page nine.

R. Rowan: We already voted on these.

J. Phillips: We voted one all these as they are written?

R. Rowan: There may have been some provisions. We'll have to go back and look at the vote. It's true that this document may not include a couple of the qualifiers that were included in that vote because it hasn't been changed since that day.

J. Phillips: I know that there were qualifiers.

R. Rowan: We have those on record and the definitions will be changed based on those qualifiers.

G. Pryor: We need to get those changed and back out to the groups. We will take these sections that have been voted on, we will make sure that the changes get made, we will underline the additions and we will strikeout the deletions so that you can have the correct copy.

J. Phillips: Did we do Tribal Lands?

R. Rowan: It's just a definition of where they are. Military Installations, State Parks/ National Forests, and Tribal Lands are kind of just "there".

J. Phillips: Well, we didn't do that. The primary land use issue associated with Tribal Lands isn't just the growth of casinos, it's the unpredictable and uncontrolled growth of casinos and related tourist attractions.

G. Hammers: On page ten, C-4 Rural Commercial, I know that we discussed this before, but I'm still confused about the relationship between C-4 and C-40.

R. Rowan: C-4 is the land use designation and C-40 is a zone.

L. Carmichael: The things that are in C-40 are not necessarily what would be allowed in C-4. We'll have to work that out when we develop our matrix.

B. Woods: Let's go quickly to Tribal Lands. Any problems with the Tribal Lands definitions?

MOTION: (J. Phillips) To change Tribal Lands definition by including "unpredictable and uncontrolled growth".

B. Woods: I think it is editorial.

MOTION withdrawn.

I Holler: The point of this is to pick up and appropriately depict lands that are truly Tribal Lands, that are reservation lands. If a tribe makes a property purchase like Singing Hills, that is not designated as "Tribal Lands". That is still an area where we have land use jurisdiction. Now, if they add to it and they go through the appropriate process, those areas become Tribal Lands.

G. Pryor: Let me make a suggestion. We are getting hung up on what is the "legal definition"- whether you call it "Tribal Land" or whether you call it "Reservation". We will make sure that the correct term is put in there. But, what I would suggest is that we just drop the last sentence altogether. Because what we're trying to do is to define. But then I would modify that because we are going to have areas annexed to the reservation. I think what we need to do so that we don't wind up doing General Plan amendments every time that they add land, would be to add a provision to say that the County contains the eighteen reservations and we add, "or those areas as may be annexed to the reservation". Because they will [be added] and at that point I want the ability to be able to move that line so that we don't have some of their land shown back in our General Plan- so that we can set it up so that we don't have to go through a Plan amendment every time.

MOTION: (M. Morgan) To add "County contains eighteen reservations" to the definition of Tribal Lands. Second (J. Horton). In Favor- 11. Opposed- 4.

B. Woods: Let's go on to Military Installations and State Parks.

R. Hensle: What about several smaller installations (that aren't mentioned)?

R. Rowan: The smaller ones could change over time.

J. Phillips: If we're going to have a land use designation then that is valuable information and we should indicate all of them.

R. Rowan: How about "has many, including Camp Pendelton, etc."?

G. Hammers: I think that is important. We have one that is small but significant in our area.

MOTION: (R. Hensle) To include all of the existing military nstallations in the description of Military Installations. Second (M. Morgan). In Favor- 13. Opposed- 2.

10 min. Break.

B. Woods: We're going to complete the items on page fourteen and fifteen.

J. Phillips: Under open space, add a comma after "safety" and add "welfare". Under the proposed conversion policy, strike the last four or five words. Change the last sentence to end with "neighboring property and communities"- the point being that there are a lot of public lands out there and we have to start worrying about community character.

MOTION: (J. Phillips) To change the Open Space definition to add "general welfare" after the word "safety". To strike the last five words of the Conversion Policy (under Open Space) and add "neighboring property and communities" after "agency property or to...". Second (M. Morgan). In Favor- 14. Opposed- 1.

B. Woods: Let's take comments on SPAs for the next fifteen minutes.

J. Phillips: May I go through proposed changes? In the third paragraph down on the first line add "*public and institutional and/or open space uses*". Add the words "*and general requirements for Specific Plans*". Strike the rest of that and replace with "*in the associated community plan document would allow a community to include...*" in their land use section.

R. Rowan: So your intent is to offer an option instead of a requirement. (We could put this information in an appendix) Putting it in an appendix does not reduce its validity.

J. Phillips: This ties the plan down.

R. Rowan: The intent was not to not include those (SPA details).

J. Phillips: I disagree with County Counsel. It should be in the land use section where we cover land uses.

R. Rowan: We'd prefer to leave it open for community preference to determine where it goes.

J. Phillips: Next ...delete the word "all". On the first dot under that, two categories, delete the whole section on existing mixed use. Add a whole section with (more SPA information). On our specific plan maps, there is a lot more on there than just the land use designations. If you throw them away, then that's all gone.

Those are the changes I would prefer and recommend for this particular subject. If we ever lose the definition of why open space is there then proposals will come in to develop those areas.

G. Pryor: Let's come up with a better way of doing this. Why don't we table this one. (To J. Phillips) You distribute your copy to us and we can get that to everyone for clarification.

MOTION: (M. Morgan) To table the definition of Specific Plan Area and have County staff reword and distribute to the committee. Second (L. Schooler). Unanimously approved.

B. Woods: Let's talk about Minutes.

L. Glavinic: Our planning group took a position on this entire document (Attachment A).

B. Woods: We have Minutes to approve.

J. Phillips: I can't approve the last Minutes.

- B. Woods:** These will be reevaluated.
- L. Jones:** There were many spaces that were missed.
- R. Rowan:** There was an audio problem and the tape ran out.
- L. Jones:** I can forward any notes that I have.
- B. Woods:** We have maps to distribute. We need to discuss the next meeting. We will not have another meeting before Christmas...we're probably talking **January...18th tentatively.**
- L. Carmichael:** What we have today are the latest Working Copy maps. Staff is here to go over these with you all. These are hot off the presses. We don't have the population numbers to go along with them today, but we will in about a week. We will mail them to the entire group. Remember that these are still *draft* maps. There is still the ability to make map changes and there will be meetings to meet with the groups.
- M. Price:** Have you run the circulation modeling?
- L. Carmichael:** The population run comes first. We should have the results sometime in January.
Changes were not substantial in most communities, and we probably don't need to meet with those communities. For other communities with extensive changes, we will probably want to schedule meetings for the beginning of January. In addition, we are looking to go to board at late January or early February, and we will keep everyone informed on that. We want your groups to be able to take a look at maps before that with our staff to review with you.
- B. Woods:** When the Planning Commission meets, I would love to have Steering Committee members there to defend our positions. The meeting date is tentative for (January) 31st.
- J. Phillips:** LeAnn mentioned circulation modeling. If you're going to change our Circulation Element, please mark up how you want to change the element. If I see any changes (you can expect) full war.
- G. Pryor:** You will see changes, and it may not be because of your community. It may be from communities around you. Looking at how you solve the problem, we have hard choices to make...to widen roads, reduce growth and development, etc.
- J. Phillips:** We have a map and want to see that as our format. We want to see changes you are coming forward with in our areas.
- R. Rowan:** Traffic modeling uses the existing Circulation Element. We haven't yet made changes. Once we have a more definitive map we will run the model with the community recommendation.
- B. Woods:** Lets get to the maps.

Working Copy, December 2002 maps were handed out to each Planning Group Chair/representative. County Planning staff were available to discuss.

Adjourn approximately 11:45am.